

**REMARKS**

This amendment is filed in response to the final Office Action dated June 30, 2005. In view of this amendment, this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

No new matter is introduced by this amendment. The amendment to claim 1 and new claim 7 are supported throughout the specification and accompanying figures, including Figures 1 and 2.

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 are rejected. Claim 1 has been amended in this response. Claim 7 is newly added.

***Notice of References Cited***

It is noted that Young et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,851,257 has not been cited on a PTO-892, although the Examiner has applied it in a rejection. It is again requested that the Examiner cite this reference on a PTO-892 in the next official action.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,851,257). This rejection is traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof respectfully requested. The following is a comparison between the invention, as claimed, and the cited prior art.

An aspect of the invention, per claim 1, is a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor substrate having two types of active regions that are a PMOS region and an NMOS region separated from each other in plan view by a PN separation film. A dual-gate electrode extends linearly across the PMOS region, the PN separation film and the NMOS region collectively on an upper side of the semiconductor substrate. The dual-gate electrode includes a P-type portion positioned on the PMOS region, an N-type portion positioned on the NMOS

region and a PN junction positioned between the P-type portion and the N-type portion. The PN junction includes a silicide region subjected to silicidation. The silicide region is apart from both the PMOS region and the NMOS region and is confined solely within an area of the PN separation film in plan view.

The Examiner asserted that Young et al. teach a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor substrate 10 having PMOS and NMOS regions separated by a PN separation film 20/420, a dual gate 72/212/451 extending linearly across the PMOS region, the PN separation film, and the NMOS region, and silicide regions 75/219. In response to our arguments in the previous response, the Examiner maintained that Young et al. discloses the claimed dual gate and further averred that Applicant admitted that the dual gate is notoriously conventional.

The factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each element of a claimed invention, such that the identically claimed invention is placed into the recognized possession of one having ordinary skill in the art. *Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.*, 329 F.3d 1358, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Crown Operations International Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.*, 289 F.3d 1367, 62 USPQ2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002). There are significant differences between the claimed semiconductor device and the device disclosed by Young et al. that would preclude the factual determination that Young et al. identically describe the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Examiner's contention that Applicant admitted that the claimed dual gate electrode is admitted prior art is vigorously traversed. Applicant has made no such admission. The Examiner's contention that Applicant has admitted that the claimed dual gate electrode is admitted prior art is clearly erroneous. If the Examiner maintains this allegation, the Examiner is requested to point out, with particularity, where such an admission was made.

Young et al. do not anticipate the claimed semiconductor device because Young et al. do not disclose the dual gate electrode extending linearly across the PMOS region, the PN separation film, and the NMOS region, as required by claim 1. The gate structures of Young et al. that the Examiner considers to be the dual gate electrode (Reference Nos. 72, 212, 451) do not linearly extend across the PMOS, PN, and NMOS regions. Rather, as clearly shown in the Figures relied on by the Examiner, separate electrodes are formed on the PMOS, PN, and NMOS regions.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Liaw (U.S. Patent No. 6,214,656). This rejection is traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof respectfully requested.

The Examiner averred that Liaw teaches a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor substrate 10 having PMOS and NMOS regions separated by a PN separation film 12, a dual gate 30/32 extending linearly across the PMOS region, the PN separation film, and the NMOS region, and silicide region 62.

Liaw, however, does not anticipate the instant claims because Liaw does not disclose that the silicide layer is apart from both the PMOS region and the NMOS region and **confined solely** within an area of the PN separation film in plan view, as required by claim 1. Rather, Liaw teaches that the silicide layer 62 is adjacent to the PMOS and NMOS regions in plan view, as shown in FIG. 15. Furthermore, advertent to Figs. 7-10 and 14, the silicide layer of Liaw is formed beyond the area of the PN separation film.

The factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the disclosure in a single reference of each element of a claimed invention. *Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok Ltd.*, 208 F.3d 1339, 54 USPQ2d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper*

*Life Sciences, Inc.*, 34 F.3d 1048, 32 USPQ2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Hoover Group, Inc. v. Custom Metalcraft, Inc.*, 66 F.3d 399, 36 USPQ2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Young et al. do not disclose the dual gate electrode extending linearly across the PMOS region, the PN separation film, and the NMOS region, the dual gate electrode including a P-type portion positioned on the PMOS region and an N-type portion positioned on the NMOS region, and Liaw does not disclose the silicide region is apart from both the PMOS and the NMOS region and is confined solely within an area of the PN separation film in plan view, as required by claim 1, Young et al. and Liaw do not anticipate claim 1.

Applicant further submits Young et al. and Liaw, whether taken alone, or in combination do not suggest the claimed semiconductor device.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liaw in view of Goto (U.S. Patent No. 5,902,121). This rejection is traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof respectfully requested.

The Examiner asserted that Liaw substantially teaches the claimed invention but Liaw does not show a contact to active region overlapping the dual gate. The Examiner relied on Goto's teaching of contacts overlapping gate patterns and concluded that one of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to substitute the overlapping contacts in order to enhance the margin of alignment.

The combination of Goto et al. with Liaw, however, does not suggest the claimed semiconductor device because Goto et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Liaw. Goto et al. do not

**Application No.: 10/724,618**

suggest the silicide region is apart from both the PMOS and the NMOS region and is **confined solely** within an area of the PN separation film in plan view, as required by claim 1. Therefore, the instant claims would not have been obvious in view of the teachings of Goto et al. and Liaw.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further distinguish the claimed invention.

New claim 7 is allowable over the cited prior art. New claim 7 requires that the silicide region is in contact with the gate oxide film. The cited prior art does not suggest the silicide region, as required by claim 7. For example, as clearly shown in Liaw, the silicide region 62 does not contact gate oxide layer 14.

In light of the above Remarks, this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding these remarks or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Bernard P. Codd

Registration No. 46,429

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BPC:kap  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: October 31, 2005**